DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 464 484 FL 027 244

AUTHOR Johnstone, Barbara; Danielson, Andrew
TITLE "Pittsburghese" in the Daily Papers, 1910-1998: Historical Sources of Ideology about Variation.
PUB DATE 2001-10-00
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of New Ways of Analyzing Variation (30th, Raleigh, NC, October 11-14, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Diachronic Linguistics; Ideology; Language Usage; *Language Variation; Newspapers; *Regional Dialects; Speech Habits; Urban Language
IDENTIFIERS *Pennsylvania (Pittsburgh)

ABSTRACT

This paper explores how one facet of the process by which ideology about linguistic variation originates and circulates. It analyzes an archive consisting of newspaper articles from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, about Pittsburgh speech, the earliest of which is from 1910. The articles began appearing regularly during the 1950s-60s. First, the paper sketches changes in the focus of these articles (early ones are about proverbs, later ones are about words, and recent ones describe phonological variation), and it notes changes in the attitudes the articles express about local speech. It touches on the changing role of scholarly authority in public discourse about "real" Pittsburgh speech and explores one facet of the standardization of non-standard forms via public representation and discussion of them. It examines how the words, structures, and sounds that now appear repeatedly whenever local speech is described originally came to be thought of as "real" or "good" (or even "correct") Pittsburghese. In particular, it traces the history of spellings of two non-standard forms, "redd up" (meaning tidy up) and "yinz" (a second-person plural pronoun). (Contains 20 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 464 484

"Pittsburghese" in the Daily Papers, 1910-1998: Historical Sources of Ideology about Variation

Barbara Johnstone, Andrew Danielson
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh PA 15213-3890

paper presented at N-WAV (New Ways of Analyzing Variation), North Carolina State University, Raleigh NC, October 2001. *Please do not quote without the authors' permission.*

Introduction

Social evaluations of ways of talking help drive language change (Labov 2001), and variationist sociolinguists have long been aware of the sometimes explicit nature of these evaluations (Sankoff and Laberge 1978, Sankoff et al. 1989). In studies of perceptual dialectology (Preston 1989, 1999), performances of dialect (Schilling-Estes 1998, Johnstone 1999), and public discourse about dialect (Lippi-Green 1997; Milroy 2001), as well as sociolinguistic work with an explicitly ethnolinguistic component that asks people not only to talk but to talk about how they talk (Johnstone and Bean 1997, Lane 1998, Dyer 2000), variationists are paying increasing attention to the role of ideology. In this paper, we explore how one facet of the process by which ideology about linguistic variation originates and circulates. We analyze an archive consisting of newspaper articles about Pittsburgh speech, the earliest from 1910. We first sketch changes in the focus of these articles (early ones are about proverbs, later ones about words, and recent ones describe phonological variation) and in the attitudes they express about local speech. As we do this, we touch on the changing role of scholarly authority in public discourse about "real" Pittsburgh speech. We then explore one facet of the standardization of non-standard forms via public representation and discussion of them. Our general question is this: how did the words, structures, and sounds which now appear repeatedly whenever local speech is described originally come to be thought of as "real" or "good" (or even "correct") Pittsburghese? In particular, we trace the history of spellings of two non-standard forms, "redd up" (meaning tidy up) and "yinz" (a second-person plural pronoun).

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Barbara Johnstone

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL 027244

Talk about Talk in Southwestern Pennsylvania

As in at least some other speech communities with prevalent non-standard speech features, in southwestern Pennsylvania there is a fair amount of public discourse about local speech, which is almost always referred to as "Pittsburghese." While most features that are thought of as "Pittsburghese" are not strictly local, certain ones have come to be highly identified with local speakers and local identity, and are repeatedly pointed to in discussions of Pittsburgh speech. (With this in mind, these items will be referred to as "Pittsburghese" in this paper, whether they are strictly local or not). Among the lexical items that are popularly classified as "Pittsburghese" are the second person plural "yinz," the term "redd up" meaning to tidy up, and "gumbands" for rubber bands. Pronunciation features include the pronunciation of /aw/ as [a:] as in [da:nta:n] (usually spelled "dahntahn") for "downtown" and the pronunciation of /i/ before /l/ and in certain other environments as [ɪ], as in "Stillers" for "Steelers," Pittsburgh's professional football team.

Public discourse about local speech dates back at least to the early twentieth century, as we will show. When "Pittsburghese" is oriented to as a marker of social class, it is seen as a social liability, but when it is seen as a potential marker of local identity it is a source of humor and pride. Public discussion of local speech is part of the process by which attitudes towards it are reoriented in this way. The overt tone of this discussion ranges from disparagement to humor to concern over how the use of nonstandard speech can negatively affect perceptions of speakers' intelligence and sophistication. Its topic has moved over time from sayings and proverbs to words and sounds, and from speech itself to speakers.

The Carnegie Library Archive

The data for this study consists of an archive of articles, books, and other printed material on the topic of Pittsburgh speech in the Pennsylvania Collection at the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh. According to librarians currently working at the Carnegie Library, Rose Demorest, the first head librarian of the Pennsylvania department, probably started the collection. The first newsprint clipping (as opposed to microfilm copy) is from 1952, making this the likely date that the file was created. The file consists primarily of newspaper and magazine articles, but it also includes several Pittsburghese glossaries, as

well as excerpts from Kurath and McDavid's *The Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic states* (Kurath and McDavid 1961). While a majority of the articles focus on pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar, there are several articles on other language topics, such as issues surrounding Pennsylvanians whose first language is Spanish, local proverbs, and AAVE "slang."

With a subset of these data it is possible to track the evolution of the discussion of Pittsburgh speech, as well as the development of orthographic norms for nonstandard pronunciations and words. For the purpose of this paper we look at the nineteen articles in the collection that are from Pittsburgh publications and that discuss pronunciation, lexical, and grammatical features that are described as characteristic of "Pittsburghese." We also include one article not currently found in this collection, but from the personal papers of Dr. Robert Parslow, a linguist who studied Pittsburgh speech in the 1960s and 1970s. A list of these articles is provided at the end of the paper.

In all, there were over 230 individual representations of features of Pittsburgh speech in these articles. Among the words and sounds most often represented are "redd up," "yinz," "gumbands" for "rubber bands," "nebby" for "nosey," "cupboard" for clothes closet, the "need" or "want" plus past participle construction (as in, for example, "The car needs washed") and the monophthongal pronunciation of /aw/ as [a:]. Some of features appear very early on -- "red" or "rid" up and the construction represented in "the car needs washed" are represented in the first article that talks about grammar and lexicon, from 1952, (Love 1952), and "you-uns" is attributed to "mountaineers" in a 1959 article (Swetnam 1959). Others are not represented until much later: The pronunciation of /i/ as [ɪ] appears first in Bloom 1977, and the "general extender" "'n'at" ("and that," or "and so on") is not represented until the 1990s (Gitman 1997).

The earliest article in the collection is from December 1910 (Carrell 1910). It discusses a number of proverbs and aphorisms said to be used by Pittsburghers, attributing many of them to the ethnic origins of the speakers and speculating humorously about why so many proverbs "slam" women, tailors, and lawyers. This is one of the two articles in the corpus written by a woman, and it appeared on the women's page of the newspaper. We will not discuss this article further here, since it is not about features of grammar, lexis, or pronunciation.

Early Articles in the Archive: 1950s and 1960s

The next article in the archive (Love 1952) is from over 40 years later. Appearing on the first page of the second section of the *Pittsburgh Press*, it was written by a one of the *Press*'s regular columnists. While this article represents a number of features that continue to be thought of as Pittsburgh speech, most of the features it describes are lexical items attributed to rural southwestern Pennsylvania counties which do not appear in later articles (for example, "piggers" for small pigs, "yoe" for "ewe"). The article also claims that nonstandard stress on the first syllable of words like "UMbrella" and "POlice" is a feature of Pittsburgh speech. Information about word origins is somewhat idiosyncratic, with "poke" for "sack" and "blind" for "screen" described as "old Saxon words," while "hap" for quilt is attributed to "Scandinavian."

The next article (Swetnam 1959) does not appear until over seven years later. The focus of this article, which revisits the 1910 ladies' page article from the *Pittsburg Dispatch* described above, is on proverbs. The next article, also written by Swetnam for the *Pittsburgh Press*, focuses fairly equally on lexical and pronunciation features, as well mentioning a few grammatical features. The author makes a point of describing local speech as giving "a distinct impression of ignorance." Nonstandard stress appears again here, represented in the spelling of the word "Deetroit". Three months after this article appeared, the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* ran an article (Bernhard 1959) that featured many of the same representations. The reversal of transitivity in "leave"/"let," "cupboard" for closet, the positive use of "any more," "beal" for some sort of injury, and "need"/"want" plus past participle (with "wants" in Swetnam, and with "needs" in Bernhard) are among these features.

Both 1959 articles mention an intonation pattern for certain yes/no questions which is characteristic of the region, though they describe it in contradictory ways: Swetnam claims that Pittsburghers end questions with dropping intonation, while Bernhard says they end statements with rising intonation. Bernhard also represents stop elision at the beginning and middle of consonant clusters in words like "din't" (didn't), "woun't" (wouldn't), and "strenth" (strength). He categorizes these pronunciations with

the addition of [θ] to "height". Bernard refers to these two features as his "favorite speech oddity" in Pittsburgh speech.

Another five and a half years pass before the next article in the corpus (Gleason 1965). The first part of this article compares Pittsburgh regionalisms to those in Ohio and Chicago, and recognizes that "[e]ven England…has regional speech differences". This is the first article to represent the monophthongization of /ay/, with spellings like, "f-ah-rs" contrasted with the standard "f-eye-rs" (fires). Another feature in this article purported to be Pittsburgh speech is "arthur-rite-is" for "arthritis" (which, Gleason writes, should be "ar-thrigh-tis"). The tone of this article is, like that of earlier ones, fairly pejorative. Gleason states toward the end of the article that, "the nasal way of talking…made it possible in the 30s to identify Pittsburghers vacationing out of state".

Gray 1968 describes many of the features found in previous articles. This is the earliest article that uses respellings that have since become common for two Pittsburgh neighborhoods: "Sahside" (South Side) and "Sliberty" (East Liberty). It also mentions the local the use of "pop" for "soda". Following Gleason 1967, this article presents the speech features it discusses as part of a local dialect, rather that just being curious or incorrect.

To summarize: of the articles that began appearing regularly during the 1950s and 1960s, a large majority were feature articles, many appearing in the *Pittsburgh Press*'s Sunday magazine section, segregated from the "real" news and accompanied by cartoon illustrations. These early articles generally isolate and describe features of regional speech, treating them by and large as curiosities. While many of the features consistently thought of as Pittsburgh speech are mentioned in several of these articles, there are a number of observations about Pittsburgh speech that did not survive in the ongoing local discussion that this archive represents. For example, "yinz," "redd up," "gumband," the monophthongal pronunciation of /aw/ ("dahntahn"), and the "want" or "need" plus past participle construction appear early in and consistently throughout the archive, but other elements disappear after these early treatments.

Some of the early observations that did not persist in later representations of local usage are features that do not seem to have persisted in actual local usage. For instance, the term "beal" as "small tumor or suppuration" (Bernhard 1959) or "infection"

(Swetnam 1959) does not seem to remain current in the local speech of subsequent decades, nor does "rift," meaning "belch." Other features appear to persist in usage but not in the media discourse about it. Stop deletion in consonant clusters in words like "didn't" ("din't") and "wouldn't" ("wouln't") (Swetnam 1959) continue in local usage but have failed to remain strongly identified with Pittsburgh speech in talk about it. Other examples are the pronunciation of "arctic" and "February" as "artic" and "Febuary" (Swetnam 1959), and "let" being used to mean "leave" and vice versa (Love 1952, Swetnam 1959, Bernhard 1959), all of which can still be heard in Pittsburgh but are not strongly identified as local in public discourse about local speech.

Local speech is characterized almost exclusively in a disparaging way in these early articles. Evaluative phrases like, "my favorite speech oddity" (Bernhard 1959), "the nasal way of talking" (Gleason 1965), and "a distinct impression of ignorance" (Swetnam 1959) make it clear that examples of Pittsburgh speech presented are meant to be taken as amusing but undesirable irregularities. Another way in which Pittsburgh speech is presented as an object of reproach is through the use of "eye-dialect" spellings in several articles. In two different articles (Gleason 1965, Gleason 1967), one journalist takes particular delight in exploring the orthographic possibilities for representing "Pittsburghese." Gleason takes issue with Pittsburgh vowel pronunciations in spellings like "f-ah-rs" (as opposed to "f-eye-ers"), "ahtside" (outside) and the now very frequent "dahntahn" (downtown). The eye-dialect becomes even more marked with representations of words like "arthritis" ("arthur-rite-is"), "bronchial" ("bron-ickel"), and "blue" ("blu-oo"). While the two former spellings can be said to suggest non-standard pronunciation, the latter is less informative, especially given the explanation with which Gleason follows up the spelling: he describes this word as being given a "French twist" by Pittsburgh speakers, which seems to be apropos of nothing about local speech origins.

The second Gleason article is also the first in the archive to feature quotations from a working linguist – in this case Robert Parslow, who at the time was teaching at the University of Pittsburgh. Aside from debunking the notion that Pittsburgh dialect has roots in Pennsylvania German (a notion that the article implies was common at the time), Parslow also refers to the Linguistic Atlas project for the region (McDavid 1980). Parslow is quoted extensively throughout the article, discussing the place of Pittsburgh

speech in the Midlands dialect region as well as the historical background of the Northern region. The merger of /a/ and /ɔ/ (using "card" and "cord" as the example) is described as one feature that differentiates Pittsburgh speech from Northern speech. "Yinz" (in this case spelled "you'ns) is (inaccurately) identified as coming to Pittsburgh via West Virginia. This is also the earliest appearance of the word "Pittsburghese" in the corpus. This article represents the first truly "serious" examination of Pittsburgh speech, in contrast to Gleason's earlier article.

Articles Since 1970: Legitimizing the Dialect

The inclusion of testimony by linguists marks a shift away from treating "Pittsburghese" as a mere curiosity and toward legitimizing the discussion. This trend continues. Of the twelve articles in the archive that appeared after 1967, nine feature some sort of "expert" testimony.

The next article (Swetnam 1972) compares Pittsburgh speech to other American regional dialects, focusing almost entirely on lexical items. All of these items are presumably drawn from the *Dictionary of American Regional English* (in its prepublished state), since the article mentions Frederic Cassidy and his project. Some items include "caty cornered" (Pittsburgh) versus "andy godlin" or "sky godlin" (South) meaning "built askew," and "grinny" (Pittsburgh) versus "chippy" (South) meaning "ground squirrel". This article also revisits vocalized /l/, in spellings like "know-idge" and "te-wi-vision" ("Why we can't say the letter eh-wuh I cannot teh-wuh").

Linguist Robert Parslow is again featured in the next article (McGough 1973). This article repeats many of the concepts in the previous article that featured Parslow regarding Pittsburgh's place in the Midlands dialect region, and Parslow is quoted as saying, "[a]ny feature of speech in this area can be related with reasonable certainty to the Scotch Presbyterians." There are examples given of similar speech features existing in Northern Ireland, specifically "need"/"want" plus past participle ("needs settled fast" is attributed to an "Ulsterman"). This contrasts with Gleason 1965, where it is implied that there were also significant German and Welsh influences. Dialect preservation is another theme Parslow talks about. One pronunciation feature noted for the first time in this article is vocalized /l/, represented in "mi-yan" for "million."

Browne 1976 is the earliest article to introduce speakers and hearers of local speech as sources of testimony. There is a slightly pejorative tone in a quote from Mrs. Nancy Brashears, who moved to Pittsburgh "2½ years ago," when she discusses the "peculiar pronunciations" of Pittsburghers. Browne later cites a secondary English teacher, Anita Panek, as an expert voice. Panek's contribution to the article is an introduction to the concept of idiolects, and she attributes the ability to distinguish "branch idiolects" – speech differences among nearby localities – to trained linguists (Parslow makes a similar statement in Gleason 1967). This statement helps to build the authority of linguists, and puts a legitimate light on a topic that this article otherwise treats with some frivolity. (It is notable, though, that linguistics is invoked immediately after Browne makes the very unlikely claim that "early German, Polish, and Balto-Slovak settlements give rise to guttural G and whirring consonants," in Pittsburgh speech!)

Bloom 1977 is the earliest article to mention the pronunciation of /i/ as [ɪ], representing "field" as "filled," "steel" as "still," and "Little League" as "Little Lig." New features continue to be included in the articles from the 1970s and 80s. An article from 1979 spends a fair number of column inches describing what is called an "NG Click" (like "guttural G" and "whirring consonant," this is not a technical term in linguistics), represented in spellings like "going GOUT". This article notes and takes issue with a few grammatical features as well, referring to a "gratuitous at" as in "where's he at" and a "gratuitous of" in "he's not too good of a bowler." This is one of only five articles in the collection in which the author refers to Pittsburghers as "we," identifying with the local audience rather than talking about them.

Robert Parslow is again the resource for the next article (Huzinec 1978). With the exception of a few features, this article reiterates many features found in previous articles. Laxing of /u/ to /U/ is represented in the spelling of "pool" as "pull." Regional dialects are again cast in a positive light by Parslow, which seems to be a growing attitude in the articles from the late 1970s. The next article (McHugh 1979) revisits Frederic Cassidy and the Dictionary of American Regional English (Cassidy 1985, 1991, 1996). The first point of this article is to demonstrate that Pittsburgh is not alone in the use of "yinz," attributing it to Ulster Scots and pointing out, by way of illustrating the connection between Scots and the language of western Pennsylvania, that the spellings of

"Pittsburgh" and "Edinburgh" follow the same standard. McHugh himself does not use a consistent orthographic standard in representing monophthongal /aw/; in one instance he says that "outlanders" should be read "ottlanders," but in the same sentence spells "downtown" as "dahntahn" (the "ah" spelling for this sound is by far the most common in this archive). The substitution of [n] for [ŋ] is represented in spellings like "len'th" and "stren'th," and Cassidy is quoted as saying these are "fairly widespread variations." Cassidy further states that "warsh" is most prevalent in Western Pennsylvania, and that he has not found "golf" for "gulf" in any other place.

Peter Leo, a regular columnist and the writing coach for the Pittsburgh *Post-Gazette*, focuses almost exclusively on copula deletion in his 1982 article in the corpus. He cites headline copy from the Dallas *Times-Herald* that reads "Rangers' Putnam Wants Traded," and speculates that Putnam (a baseball player) may be from the Pittsburgh region. He goes on to describe other occurrences of this feature, and, again making use of expert testimony cites University of Pittsburgh linguist Jack Bucsko who describes it as a Scottish feature. The only other Pittsburghese feature he mentions is "nebby" for "nosey", which is used in context but not discussed. The next article (Davidson 1984) is a rather tongue-in-cheek list of ten features claimed to be Pittsburgh speech, several of which have not appeared in any other article. A word like "prothonotary" ("pronounced pruh-THON-uh-terri"), for example, is easily demonstrated not to be exclusively local, and it seems highly dubious that it is actually even thought of by Pittsburghers, this being a term for a local elective office that people think of as peculiar rather than a local term per se.

The articles from the 1990s are by far the ones most oriented to speakers of Pittsburghese. Warnick 1990 and Kloman 1992 both discuss career difficulties that nonstandard speech can result in. Both of these articles discuss ways in which social contact with speakers of other varieties can initiate changes in individuals' speech. Warnick cites several experts and educators in his article on Lawrenceville (a Pittsburgh neighborhood) speech. Sam McCool, author of *Sam McCool's New Pittsburghese* (McCool 1982) states that the city is becoming more white-collar, which is influencing speakers of the local variety. Richard Enos, a Carnegie Mellon University English professor, is quoted as saying that there is "pressure to conform to more of a

standardization" due to a changing local economy. Educators in Lawrenceville seem to have a different perspective. The principal of a local elementary school says that children are not aware of having nonstandard speech, since it is what they have learned from adults. The educators are sympathetic to speakers of the local dialect and feel that it has its place outside of the classroom. The Kloman article quotes several different linguists and employers regarding local speech in the workplace. The idea that this article promotes is that while local speech is stigmatized in certain situations like the workplace, speakers are often able to switch to a more standard variety in those situations.

The next article (Gitman 1997) introduces the "Learn Pittsburghese in a Day!" website (now at http://www.pittsburghese.com). This site invites submissions from the public to include in their online glossary, and the article identifies two "new" "Pittsburghese" words from the site. The final article in the collection (Ove 1998) tells the story of a priest currently living in Rome, formerly from Pittsburgh and originally from Yonkers, NY, and his perspective on Pittsburgh speech. The representations of monophthongal /aw/ ("clahdy", "Dahntahn") and the pronunciation of /i/ as /ɪ/ ("Stillers") in this article represent the most standard orthographies for these features.

Standardizing "Pittsburghese" Through Representations in Print

As we have seen, local-sounding speech comes to be treated in an increasingly (though never entirely) respectful way over the course of the series of articles. Expert testimony becomes more frequent, and the possibility that the local way of talking may actually be appropriate in some situations begins to be broached. Through these discursive moves, "Pittsburghese" begins to acquire some legitimacy. As it is talked about repeatedly in the same or similar ways, it also gets increasingly standardized. For example, the orthography of "Pittsburghese" has in general tended to become more and more consistent over time. That is to say that the written representation of non-standard local speech undergoes the same kind of standardization process as does standard orthography (on standardization in general see Milroy and Milroy 1985; on nonstandard orthographies Jaffe 2000).

There are several routes that the orthographic standardization of "Pittsburghese" has taken. Certain sounds are represented by the same graphemes as in other, standard

English words. Because the use of familiar graphemes can be seen as the most economical way to represent those sounds, the standardization seems relatively simple and natural. Other words are more problematic, however. In this corpus, the word "yinz" is spelled variously as "yinz," "y'nz", "you-ns," "you-uns," "yuhnz," "yunz," and "you-unz." The different spellings of this feature seem to indicate that it is thought of as variable across the region; two of the articles in this corpus discuss whether a monosyllabic or disyllabic pronunciation is correct, and whether a person thinks /y^nz/ or /yɪnz/ is the more common pronunciation obviously also influences the choice of a spelling. The trend over time has been for spellings that represent the morphological structure and historical origin of the word, like "you-uns," to be replaced with increasingly phonetic spellings, such as "yuhnz," "yunz," and "yinz." A search of the Internet for the various spellings of "yinz" supports this claim. The search engine www.google.com treated the spellings above that include punctuation as two separate words, so the data for these were not included. But the returns for the other spellings from this corpus – "yinz," 1,060; "yunz," 385; "younz," 113; "yuhnz," 0 – suggest that while "yunz" is still used, "yinz" has become the preferred spelling. The issue is still alive, however. Two parallel but independent presentations of Pittsburgh history called "Pittsburgh A to Z" – a museum show and a film -- that were produced in 2001 both chose "yinz" as the item for the letter "y." As the consulting linguist for both projects, the senior author of this paper was asked how the word should be spelled, but she managed not to take a stand on the issue. Instead, she encouraged both the exhibit curator and the filmmaker to ask Pittsburghers how they spell the word, as a way to get people to think about their stake in how localness is defined. The museum chose "yunz" for its display. The filmmaker, whose medium did not require him to display the item visually, chose not to make a choice between "yinz" and "yunz," instead showing a local t-shirt design modeled on the car stickers that identify vacation spots, a black-bordered oval that says YNZ.

In contrast to this, the spelling of "redd up" is far more consistent in the corpus. This feature appears twelve times in these articles, and is spelled "redd up" nine times. Other spelling options were "red up" and "rid up." That "redd up" is a less economical but nonetheless more prevalent choice indicates that there is a different mechanism of

standardization at play. Rather than being the result of a move from more morphologically-based spelling to more phonetic spelling, it is possible that this spelling somehow survives from conventional spellings of Scots and Ulster speech (Warrack 1911: 448). If "redd up" is the Pittsburgh spelling because it is the Ulster spelling, we need to find out how this spelling survived over at least a century during which the word was probably rarely used in writing in Pennsylvania.

What is interesting about the history of written representations of local speech from the perspective of variationist sociolinguistics is that such representations may play a role in some aspects of language change. Linguistic ideology is created and perpetuated in metalinguistic discourse that alludes to social meanings of aspects of talk. One site for such discourse is the media. Newspaper articles about "Pittsburghese" not only reflect but help construct linguistic stereotypes (Labov 1972: 180) and other aspects of local attitudes and beliefs about Pittsburgh speech. When visual representations of local speech become increasingly focused (LePage and Tabouret-Keller 1985), so, possibly, do cognitive representations of the phonology and morphology of local lexical items and grammatical and phonological features, at least in some instances and for some people. In both cases, dialect focusing is a result of repeated metalinguistic representation: the more people talk about, imitate, perform, and otherwise represent what localness sounds like, the more they come to think of local speech in a coordinated way, as a variety with fixed characteristics and a correct way of representing them.

In the development of an increasingly unified, focused image of Pittsburgh speech in local discourse about localness, it is intriguing to note the key role that has been played linguists, beginning with dialectologists in the dialect atlas tradition such as Cassidy and Parslow. In Pittsburgh, Robert Parslow played a key role in delimiting a particular set of words as potential symbols of localness. He may have been the source of the word "Pittsburghese," in fact, and in the late 1960s he produced a humorous list of local words and structures, with nonstandard, semi-phonetic spellings, which may very well have been the basis for subsequent popularizations and for some of the spellings used in them. In future work – and in our own continuing discussions with Pittsburghers on this topic -- it will be interesting to think further about the interplay between public and scholarly expertise in the discursive construction of localness and local dialect.

References

1. Articles from Carnegie Library Archive

Berhhard, A. (1959, December 14). Pittsburgh speech has its own differences. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 2.

Bloom, S. (1977). Everyone talks funny but us. *The Pittsburgher, 1(3)*, 39, 79.

Browne, J. (1976, December 20). Our towne. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, B-1.

Carrell, M. (1910, December 12). Pittsburg's sayings and proverbs. *Pittsburg Dispatch*, section 5, p. 7.

Davidson, J. (1984, December 30). We'uns sure stretch the king's English. *Pittsburgh Press, Sunday Magazine*, 4.

Gitman, M. (1997, January 20). Internet 'n'at:Website pools the finer points of Pittsburghese. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, D2.

Gleason, D. (1965, May 30). What's that you said. *Pittsburgh Press, Sunday Magazine*, 3.

Gleason, D. (1967, June 18). Strictly Pittsburghese: Only in Western Pennsylvania to you hear 'gum band' and 'needs washed.' *Pittsburgh Press, Sunday Magazine*, 3.

Gray, J. (1968, July 14). Dialect in dilemma. *Pittsburgh Press, Family Magazine*, (page number illegible).

Huzinec, M. (1978, November 21). Pitt prof finds Pittsburghese a slippy subject. *Pittsburgh Press*, A-2.

Kloman, H. (1992, February). The truth and consequences of Pittsburghese: How you say *Downtown* can affect your career. *Pittsburgh Magazine*, 40-43.

Leo, P. (1982, June 21). This column needs read. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, 4.

Love, G. (1952, January 18). What we say. *Pittsburgh Press*, 23 (first page of Section 2).

McGough, M. (1973, October 15). Pittsburghers have a dialect all their own. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Daily Magazine*, 22.

McHugh, R. (1979, September 9). He Scotches Pittsburgh monopoly on "yunz." *Pittsburgh Press*, A-2.

Ove, T. (1998, January 19). Pals send tape an 'at to priest in Rome. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, B1-B2.

Swetnam, G. (1959, September 6). Pittsburgh patois. *Pittsburgh Press, Sunday Magazine*, 4-5.

Swetnam, G. (1959, March 8). Pittsburgh's peculiar proverbs. *The Pittsburgh Press, Sunday Magazine*, 3.

Swetnam, G. (1972, October 15). Your talk tells tales. *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Sunday Magazine*, 10-11.

Warnick, M. S. (1990, July 15). Lawrenceville aside, fewer of yunz speak Pittsburghese. *Pittsburgh Press*, H1, H4.

2. Works Cited

Cassidy, F. G., ed. (1985, 1991, 1996). *Dictionary of American Regional English*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Dyer, J. (2000, 27-29 April). *"We all speak the same round here": Dialect levelling in a Scottish-English community.* Presented at the Sociolinguistic Symposium 2000, University of the West of England, Bristol.

Johnstone, B. (1999). Uses of Southern speech by contemporary Texas women. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, special issue on Styling the Other, 3,* 505-522B. Rampton (Ed.).

Johnstone, B., & Bean, J. M. (1997). Self-expression and linguistic variation. *Language in society, 26,* 221-246.

Kurath, H., & McDavid, R. I. (1961). *The pronunciation of English in the Atlantic states.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Labov, W. (2001). *Principles of linguistic change: Social factors.* Malden, MA; Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Lane, L. A. (1998). *Emergence and transformation of a dialect: Thyborønsk (Danish).* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

LePage, R. B., & Tabouret-Keller, A. (1985). *Acts of identity: Creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity.* Cambridge: Cambrige University Press.

Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent: Language, ideology and discrimination in the United States.* London and New York: Routledge.

McCool, S. (1982). *Sam McCool's new Pittsburghese: How to speak like a Pittsburgher.* Pittsburgh, PA: Hayford Press.

Milroy, J. (2001). Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of sociolinguistics, 5,* 530-555.

Preston, D. R. (1989). *Perceptual dialectology.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Preston, D. (Ed.). (1999). *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology* [Vol. 1]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Sankoff, D., Cedergren, H. J., Kemp, W., Thibault, P., & Vincent, D. (1989). Montreal French: Language, class, and ideology. In R. Fasold & D. Schiffrin (Eds.), *Language change and variation* (pp. 107-118). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Sankoff, D., & Laberge, S. (1978). The linguistic market and statistical explanation of variability. In D. Sankoff (Ed.), *Linguistic variation: Methods and models* (pp. 239-250). New York: Academic Publishers.

Schilling-Estes, N. (1998). Investigating "self-conscious" speech: The performance register in Ocracoke English. *Language in Society, 27,* 53-83.

Warrack, A. (Compiler). (1911). *Chambers Scots dictionary.* Edinburgh, London: W. & R. Chambers, LTD.